

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/597,263	07/18/2006	Nobutaka Nakajima	39951	8493	
PEARNE & G	7590 03/17/200 GORDON L.I.P	EXAMINER			
1801 EAST 97		ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA			
CLEVELAND	O. OH 44114-3108		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	, 011 11111 2100		3742		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/17/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/597,263	NAKAJIMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
M. Alexandra Elve	3742	

		M. Alexandra Elve	3742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING D. A STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY PROPERTY IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. A STATE 1.13. SIX (6) MCNITIS from the mailing date of this communication. SIX (6) MCNITIS from the mailing date of this communication, be specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply years specified above, the maximum statutory period was not present of the property	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_ action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is			
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Applicati	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 July 2006</u> is/are: a)\$ Applicant may not request that any objection to the Applacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C				
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) M Notic	on of References Cited (RTO 902)	4) Interview Summers	(DTO 412)				

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5/05)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/28/07, 7/18/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other: __

Application/Control Number: 10/597,263

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior at are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiser (USPN 6,242,113) in view of Kudo et al. (USPN 4,400,209) and Kawaguchi et al. (JP 11-170084).

Kiser discloses a welding alloy, weldments (i.e. filler) and so forth. the alloy is nickel, chromium and iron based and contains the following: C (0.005-0.05), Si (<0.50), Mn (<1.0), Cr (27-31.5), Nb (0.60-0.95), Ta (<0.10), Fe (7-11), Al (0.01-0.25), Ti (0.01-0.35), P (<0.02), S (<0.01), B (<0.01), Zr (<0.10) and balance Ni.

Kiser does not teach the presence of vanadium, nitrogen, calcium, magnesium, rare earths or oxygen; however, these elements do not specifically have to be present.

Kudo et al. discloses a high nickel, chromium and iron alloy. the composition follows: C (< 0.1), Si (<1.0), Mn (<2.0), Cr (22.5-40), Nb, Ta, Ti, Zr and V in amounts of one or more to a total amount of (0.5-4.0), P(<0.003), S (<0.005), N (0-0.30), Ca (0-0.10), Mg (0-0.10), rare earths (0-0.10), Fe (balance) and Ni (25-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use vanadium, calcium, magnesium and rare earths as taught by Kudo et al. in the Kiser welding alloy because rare earths, Ca and Mg are known for improving

Application/Control Number: 10/597,263

Art Unit: 3742

ductility (hot workability), vanadium forms nickel intermetallics for hardening and nitrogen in controlled amounts add strengthening to the alloy matrix.

Kawaguchi et al. discloses a filler metal for Ni based, high Cr alloys. the filler metal contains: C (<0.04), Si (0.1-0.5), Mn (0.2-1), Cr (28-31.5), Nb (<0.1), Fe (7-11), Al (0.5-1.1), Ti (0.5-1), P (<0.02), S (<0.01), Nb (<0.1), V (0.05-0.5), N (<0.03), O (<0.1) and balance Ni.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to minimize the amount of oxygen in the nickel based alloy as taught by Kawaguchi et al. because it is well known that nickel preferentially forms oxides whose presence weakens the alloy matrix.

The exact amounts of each of the constituents as presently claimed are not disclosed in the prior art; however, the prior art compositions closely approximates or overlap applicant's claimed composition. It has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have considered the claimed compositions to have been obvious because close approximation or overlapping ranges in a composition is considered to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. See In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549, Titanium Metals v. Banner 227 USPQ 773, In re Nehrenberg 126 USPQ 383.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is 571-272-1173. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:00 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tu B. Hoang can be reached on 571-272-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

March 13, 2009.

/M. Alexandra Elve/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3742